THE Reconstructionist

Vol. IX. March 19, 1943 Adar II, 12, 5703 No. 3

EDITORIALS
- *The American Jewish Committee and the Assembly*
- *The "Stop Hitler Now" Rally*
- *Whose Are the Synagogues?*
- *A Purim Message for the World*

HIRSCH AND GRAETZ—TWO REINTERPRETERS OF JEWISH TRADITION
By Leo Trepp

BEWARE THE LOVERS OF HUMANITY!
By Miriam J. Cohen

REALITIES AND VALUES

MUSIC NOTES

CORRESPONDENCE

Dedicated to the advancement of Judaism as a religious civilization, to the upbuilding of Israel's ancient homeland, and to the furtherance of univeral freedom, justice and peace.

TIMELY PUBLICATIONS:

1) THE NEW HAGGADAH, *edited by Mordecai M. Kaplan, Eugene Kohn and Ira Eisenstein.*

This year as never before, the theme of Freedom will be honored in song and ritual. Make the Pesah Seder a stirring event by using the New Haggadah, with its prayers, readings and songs transposed into the key of Freedom.

(Published by Behrman's, 1261 Broadway, N. Y., 75c.)

2) WHAT IS TORAH?, a cantata for unison chorus and piano, *by Judith and Ira Eisenstein.*

This cantata has been used with great effect as a program for Confirmation. It is being produced for donor luncheons, conventions and rallies of all kinds. Running for twenty minutes, it takes the listeners through centuries of Jewish experience, with Torah the golden thread binding the generations.

(Published by the Jewish Reconstructionist Foundation)

3) THE RECONSTRUCTIONIST PLATFORM

This important document, representing the fundamental philosophy of the Reconstructionist movement, is now about to come off the press again, after the exhaustion of the first printing.

(Published by the Jewish Reconstructionist Foundation)

SEND YOUR FRIENDS A PURIM GIFT OF A SUBSCRIPTION TO THE RECONSTRUCTIONIST.

SEND YOURSELF A PURIM GIFT OF A MEMBERSHIP IN THE FOUNDATION.

USE BLANK BELOW

THE JEWISH RECONSTRUCTIONIST FOUNDATION,
15 West 86th Street, New York, N. Y.

Enclosed please find $.....for the following:

☐ A Purim Gift Subscription for.....
Name

.....
Address

☐ A Purim Gift Membership in the Foundation for myself.
☐ WHAT IS TORAH?
☐ THE RECONSTRUCTIONIST PLATFORM

Name .....

Address .....

THE Reconstructionist

Vol. IX. March 19, 1943 Adar II, 12, 5703 No. 3

EDITORIALS

THE AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE AND THE ASSEMBLY

IN our last issue, we discussed the failure of the American Jewish Committee to join the American Jewish Assembly. We suggested two possible reasons for its course, neither of which seemed to us to carry much weight. But an analysis of the American Jewish Committee's statement of policy, when viewed against a background of recent events, suggests a third possible ground for its action, one that seems to us more likely to represent its true motivation. That ground is the Committee's fear that, in a democratically constituted Jewish Assembly, it would be outvoted by representatives of Zionist and pro-Zionist organizations. It would then be forced to throw the weight of its moral support to the implementation of the clauses respecting the political future of Palestine that would probably be drafted by Zionists.

To be sure, there is nothing in the Committee's statement which is explicitly anti-Zionistic. In fact there is much that could be construed as coinciding with Zionist principles. The demands of the Committee with regard to Palestine are formulated as follows:

"We approve for Palestine an international trusteeship to the United Nations for the following purposes: (a) to safeguard the Jewish settlement in and Jewish immigration into Palestine and to guarantee adequate scope for future growth and development to the full extent of the economic absorptive capacity of the country; (b) to safeguard and protect the fundamental rights of all inhabitants; (c) to safeguard and protect the holy places of all faiths; (d) to prepare the country to become, within a reasonable period of years, a self-governing commonwealth under a constitution and a full bill of rights that will safeguard and protect these purposes and basic rights for all."

With the affirmative statements in this program no Zionist would be likely to take issue. But there are significant omissions from it which must be noted. There is no reference anywhere to any historic claim of the Jewish people to Palestine either on the basis of its former occupancy by the Jewish people, or on the basis of its recognition as the locale of the Jewish National Home in the Balfour Declaration, the San Remo Treaty and the Mandate under which Great Britain is supposed to administer the government of Palestine. Though expressing an interest in the "future growth and development" of the *yishuv,* the statement ex-

presses no interest in establishing a Jewish majority in Palestine True, it might be supposed that the achievement of such a majority was contemplated since that would be a natural consequence of the growth of the *yishuv* under pressure of Jewish need. But this supposition is vitiated by the setting up of the "economic absorptive capacity" of Palestine as the criterion for admission of immigration without insistence that the determination of the absorptive capacity be vested in the Jewish Agency. Experience has shown how, otherwise, that formula can be so construed as to render a Jewish majority impossible. In a word, there is nothing in the proposals of the Committee which would differentiate between Palestine and any other possible haven for Jewish refugee settlement.

That the omission, from the American Jewish Committee's statement, of any reference to Jewish national rights in Palestine was intentional and deliberate is rendered more evident when the statement is read in the light of recent events. For months, negotiations were proceeding between the Zionist Organization and the American Jewish Committee looking to an agreement with respect to the post-war status of Palestine. Among the negotiators representing the American Jewish Committee was Maurice Wertheim, at that time its chairman. For a while these negotiations seemed to be making progress. The non-Zionist negotiators seemed to be willing to accept the proposal of a Jewish commonwealth in Palestine after the war, provided they would in no way be ideologically committed to a theory of Jewish nationalism for the diaspora. But there was an intransigent element in the Committee which was not content with the policy of practical cooperation with Zionists, inherited from the leadership of Marshall, Warburg and Adler. They wanted, apparently, to demonstrate their own conception of Americanism even at a cost of calling into question the loyalty of Zionists to America. There followed the organization of the American Council for Judaism, not, to be sure, at the instigation of the American Jewish Committee but with the blessing of some of its members. Then there took place the repudiation of the leadership of Mr. Wertheim and the election, in his stead, of Judge Proskauer, who is, to put it mildly, much less friendly to Zionism than his predecessor in office. In most organizations, a change in the personnel of the presidency would not necessarily be significant, but for the American Jewish Committee it involves a radical departure from precedent. Maurice Wertheim is the first chairman of the American Jewish Committee to have been replaced during his lifetime; all his predecessors had been repeatedly re-elected as long as they lived. Apparently the anti-Zionists in the American Jewish Committee were determined to call a halt to Mr. Wertheim's efforts at collaboration with Zionists. It is against the background of these facts that the omissions in the statement of the American Jewish Committee assume significance.

We do not challenge the right of the American Jewish Committee to hold aloof from direct collaboration with Zionists, if its own convictions demand that of it. What interests us here is the reluctance of the Committee to submit the final determination of the issue of American Jewish demands with respect to Palestine to a vote of a democratically constituted Jewish Assembly, in which it would be given every opportunity to express itself. If the American Jewish Committee is certain that its policy would be defeated by the application of majority rule in the Assembly, what can it hope to accomplish by not abiding with good grace by the majority decision of organized American Jewry? Does it imagine that, with the voice of the majority articulate through

the action of the Assembly, its own independent voice would carry weight at a Peace Conference? Is it not more likely that the continued refusal of the American Jewish Committee to participate in the Assembly's deliberations would deprive the Committee of whatever authority it enjoys at present? There are those who, because of the prestige and ability of some of its leaders, regard it as a committee of "representative Jews;" but if it plays the role of sulking Achilles while the rest of organized Jewry is united in battling for Jewish survival and Jewish rights, it will, in effect, have abdicated all claim to future leadership.

We are happy that negotiations are still going on which may result in the Committee's joining the Assembly. We hope that it will see the wisdom of not insisting on impossible concessions as a condition of its participation.

THE "STOP HITLER NOW" RALLY

THE huge "Stop Hitler Now" rally held at Madison Square Garden March 1, was a moving demonstration of the grief and solidarity of American Jewry. Twenty-one thousand Jews assembled in the building to voice their demands for a concrete plan of action to save the Jews of Europe doomed to certain death. Seventy-five thousand Jews surged outside vainly trying to get into the Garden; ten thousand remained outside in the cold and listened to the speeches broadcast through amplifiers. It was a moving demonstration, also, of sympathy on the part of the American people. The rally was held under the joint auspices of the American Jewish Congress, the Church Peace Union, the Free World Association, the A.F.L., the C.I.O. and many other Jewish and non-Jewish bodies. Leaders from every walk of life—Justice Douglas of the Supreme Court, Senator Wagner, Governor Dewey, Mayor La Guardia, Bishop Tucker, Mr. Green and Mr. Carey of the A.F.L. and the C.I.O., in addition to the Archbishop of Canterbury, Sir William Beveridge and Chief Rabbi Hertz, who spoke from England, and our own leaders, Weizmann, Wise, Lipsky, Berlin and others—all joined, not only in voicing sympathy with persecuted Jews and condemnation of their persecutors, but in demanding concrete and immediate action to save European Jewry from certain destruction.

A resolution containing eleven proposals was adopted at the rally; it has since been transmitted to President Roosevelt, and through him to the United Nations. Secretary Hull, in answer to a request made at the initiative of Viscount Halifax, has already extended an invitation to British and American representatives to meet in Ottawa to undertake a preliminary exploration of the problems raised in the resolution. We fervently hope that this exploration will not be slow and extended and will end not merely in expressions of sympathy, as was the case at the Evian Conference, but in concrete implementation of the proposals so as to bring about the swift and expeditious evacuation of as many thousands as possible.

The eleven-point program is based on a sober and realistic appraisal of the situation. There is in it no futile cry for revenge and retaliation, but an outline of specific measures which can and must be taken. There is a recognition that only an inter-governmental agency with authority and power can act with despatch in this situation, that such an agency should act through the intermediation of neutral governments to secure the release of the Jews, that havens of refuge must be provided for those Jews who can be released, and that all the United Nations, including Great Britain and the United States, must themselves evince a readiness and desire to receive a fair

quota of refugees. The program further calls for the opening of the doors of Palestine to Jewish immigration, and for the feeding in Nazi-occupied countries of those to be evacuated as well as those doomed to linger under Nazi oppression. Finally, there is a recognition that it is the task of the United Nations to provide the financial guarantees that may be required to execute the program suggested.

There is one additional point we should like to stress. There are still some neutral countries in Europe—Spain and Portugal, Turkey and Sweden. These contain not only native Jews but many refugees. These countries too may soon become embroiled in the present war. While there is yet time, let us evacuate at least the refugees, to Palestine or other overseas countries. These can be saved at once. Their evacuation will make it possible for new refugees to find a temporary haven of refuge. The important thing is not to waste time in talk, not to be content merely with praising the Lord and passing pious resolutions.

This is as severe a test of the sincerity of the United Nations as they are likely to face. When we read such headlines as "But America Must Be Bound By Legislation On Immigration Secretary Declares," we are frankly filled with misgivings about the Ottawa and other conferences which will be called. We hope the voice of the American people will silence the piping and faltering voice of our State Department, and that the will of the American people as manifested at the rally will shame it into action on a scale commensurate with the need and the tragedy of the Jewish people in this hour.

WHOSE ARE THE SYNAGOGUES?

COMMENTING in our last issue on the imminent passage of a bill in New York which authorized Saturday classes for children in the public schools (the bill was shelved, by the way), we suggested that the Synagogue Council could anticipate the introduction of such bills, if, in Albany—and other state capitals — representatives of religious Jewry were present and on the alert to protect the religious interests of our people. The suggestion evoked a justified retort from the President of the Council, Dr. Israel Goldstein, who turned the tables on us and appealed for funds. Certainly, that is the crux of the matter: with sufficient funds, the Synagogue Council could maintain responsible representatives at whatever strategic points they would be required. Question: how to get the money?

This raises a fundamental issue, one which needs to be investigated at length, and with great care. The issue is the place of the synagogue in the community, the responsibility for the synagogue and for the religious interests of Jewry. Despite all the loose talk about the Jews being a "religious" community, the synagogue plays a very minor role in guiding Jewish policy. This situation is reflected in the fact that the Synagogue Council has to depend for its support on the nominal dues paid to it by the three major rabbinical bodies and the three major congregational associations, the six national organizations which it represents, and is invited to *schnorr* the rest of its expenses.

Now, to be sure, there are weaknesses in the structure of the Synagogue Council. The unanimity rule often makes it impossible for the Council to take vigorous action. The Council cannot initiate steps without the consent, not only of the representatives, but of the organizations represented. This makes the Council a somewhat cumbersome body. But structural weaknesses are not necessarily inherent; they can be corrected. The fact is that the Synagogue Council, particularly of late, under the present leadership,

has come to a realization of the crucial role which it is called upon to play as the official spokesman for the religious Jews of America. In the eyes of the non-Jewish world, the voice of Jewish religion is the only authentic voice that Jews possess, and in the past two years that voice has been heard increasingly.

But no substantial progress is possible without the support of Jewry. It is disgraceful that the President of the Council should have to buttonhole a few generous individuals for contributions. Some method must be found of financing this body. One plan would be to have every congregation associated with the Synagogue Council through its national representatives pay an annual fee of five dollars to the Council, in addition to their dues to their respective organizations. Other plans will undoubtedy come forward once people begin thinking about the problem.

There is, however, an even deeper problem, touching upon the place of the individual synagogue in the local community. The congregation is still regarded as a private enterprise, supported by those few who consider it worthwhile and necessary. The community as such —represented by the Federation or Welfare Fund—does not regard the maintenance of the synagogue as a legitimate communal need nor a legitimate community responsibility. Care of the orphan and aged, work with delinquents and with refugees, hospitalization and convalescence—these have valid claims upon Jewish communities, but not education and worship. That is a deplorable situation. We must begin to think in terms of the normal needs, and not alone in terms of the abnormal needs of Jews. This means that we shall have to rethink the entire question: whose business is the maintenance of synagogues?

Until such time, however, as community funds come to grips with the entire problem, the very men and women who now support the individual synagogues will have to take on the added burden of supporting the Synagogue Council.

A PURIM MESSAGE FOR THE WORLD

PURIM, more than any other occasion in the Jewish year, calls the attention of Jews to the need of facing the problem of anti-Semitism. The necessity of recognizing the danger to which, as a minority group "scattered abroad and dispersed," Jewry is everywhere exposed is clearly brought home to the Jews in the Book of Esther. It should not escape our notice, however, that, in the final reckoning, not only Jews but Persians suffered in consequence of Haman's anti-Semitism.

In the world today this thought needs to be stressed. Vice-President Wallace, speaking before a Conference on Christian Bases of World Order, in Delaware, Ohio, declared that "the future well-being of the world depends upon the extent to which Marxism, as it is being progressively modified in Russia, and democracy, as we are adapting it to twentieth century conditions, can live together." That is an important statement and we are glad the Vice-President had the courage to speak on the subject with such clarity and candor. But there is also another condition to world peace that needs to be affirmed no less frankly, clearly and boldly—the outlawing of anti-Semitism in every form.

As long as anti-Semitism is not penalized, it will serve as the entering wedge of fascism. It will be used as a means of diverting attention from the sins of predatory interests that oppress and exploit, to imaginary wrongs perpetrated by the Jewish people. It will be used by states with aggressive intentions against their neighbors as a technique for sow-

(*Continued on Page* 20)

THE
Reconstructionist

is published bi-weekly for twenty consecutive issues starting in Oct., by the Jewish Reconstructionist Foundation, 15 W. 86th St., New York, N. Y. Subscription: $1.00 per year; 10c. per copy; foreign, 25c. extra. Membership in Foundation, $5.00 per year, including subscription to The Reconstructionist. Entered as second class matter Jan. 9, 1935, at Post Office, New York, N. Y., under act of March 3, 1879.

EDITORIAL BOARD

Chairman: Mordecai M. Kaplan.
Associate Chairman: Ira Eisenstein.
Managing Editor: Eugene Kohn.
Associate Editors: Shlomo Bardin, Asher Block, Israel S. Chipkin, Samuel Dinin, Abraham G. Duker, Judith K. Eisenstein, Solomon Goldman, Bernard Heller, Philip Houtz, Samuel C. Kohs, Louis M. Levitsky, Theodore N. Lewis, Milton Steinberg.
Contributing Editors: Michael Alper, Nathan A. Barack, Morton M. Berman, Philip S. Bernstein, Samuel M. Blumenfield, Ben Zion Bokser, William I. Boxerman, Mortimer J. Cohen, Miriam R. Ephraim, Harry Essrig, Emanuel Gamoran, Judah I. Goldin, Jacob S. Golub, Robert Gordis, Emanuel Green, Max Kadushin, Joshua Loth Liebman, I. D. Minzberg, Edward T. Sandrow, Simon Shetzer, Joshua Trachtenberg, Jacob J. Weinstein.

REALITIES AND VALUES

TWO HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-seven members of the British Parliament are demanding of their government a full-day debate in Parliament on measures to save the Jews in Nazi-dominated lands from extermination. Whether this will be accorded them or not, the move is significant. Would that 277 American Congressmen would make themselves responsible for bringing the need of rescuing European Jewry to the attention of Congress for action! Why is it that American Congressmen seem less concerned with the problem than British members of Parliament? Is it, perhaps, that American Jews have not done all in their power to bring the situation to their attention? Or is it that Great Britain, being involved in the war for a longer time, has more completely broken with the habits of the era of appeasement and isolationism than our own country? Whatever the reason for the failure of Congress so far to take any appropriate action or even to give the problem serious discussion, we hope that it will not continue its avoidance of the subject, that it will not forever lag behind Parliament.

THE *London Times*, A CONservative British paper, came out recently with a statement that it would probably take another twenty years before the Arab population of Palestine would be sufficiently mature politically to take care of its own destiny. The article in which the statement appeared stressed the fact that "Jews have brought prosperity to Palestine, enabling the Arabs to enjoy lavish government services." This statement somewhat allays our worst fears concerning Great Britain's intentions about Palestine. It suggests that the status quo in Palestine will not, immediately after the war, be "frozen" in the form of an independent state with an Arab majority. The references to the advantages derived by Arabs from Jewish settlement holds out some hope that conditions there may be kept sufficiently fluid to give Jews a chance to strengthen their position in the land. This does not mean that our position in Palestine is not precarious but it makes room for the hope that the political situation does not preclude the possibility of realizing our aspirations, that the White Paper policy, which seemed to indicate an independent Arab State in Palestine, possibly affiliated with an Arab federation, is not necessarily the last word of the British Government on the subject.

FOURTEEN EPISCOPAL CHURches of Milwaukee County, Wisconsin, have recently opened an evening school for prayer. The school aims "to teach the methods of making prayer deeper, stronger, more soul-satisfying . . . to teach the fundamentals of prayer, the uses of prayer, the strength of prayer." This is a wholesome development and Jews should imitate it. We must get over the idea that merely repeating the prayers of others is praying, or the equally absurd notion that at any time and at any place, without previous preparation, we can, as occasion arises, resort to prayer for strength, guidance or solace. Before we can avail ourselves of prayer as a resource of the spirit, we must know why we pray, how to pray and what we can hope to achieve through prayer. Prayer is the art of religious self-expression; it needs to be cultivated like every other art. Spontaneity and sincerity are not hampered when we take prayer seriously enough to subject ourselves to the discipline of the art. The Hasidim who insisted most on spontaneity of religious emotion also were the most sedulous in insisting on *kavvanah* or the cultivation of an attitude of religious devotion as a prerequisite to genuine prayer.

▼

REFORM JUDAISM CONTINUES to reform itself, and that is a happy development. Dr. Louis I. Newman, in a statement recently prepared, calls upon the Temples in the Reform group to make their services more Jewish, by making use of traditional music and folkways. He correctly points out that the new Union Prayerbook has reintroduced considerable amounts of Hebrew, and has revived many traditions and customs expunged from the earlier editions. This is in line with the steps taken by the leaders of Reform in making Zionism part of their Statement of Principles. Dr. Newman is absolutely right in insisting that the new spirit in Reform should express itself not only in doctrinal affirmations, but in the prayer and song of worship. We are happy that his appeal to Reform is in no small measure a reflection of his personal affinity to our movement. We hope his words bear fruit.

▼

MADISON SQUARE GARDEN IN New York was packed on March 1: a meeting of protest against Nazi massacres was held. On March 9 the Garden was again packed: a dramatic presentation was offered in protest against the Nazi massacres. Now, no attempt will be made here to compare or contrast the meetings. But the Jews of America should recognize that, as long as there are two Jewish peoples, responsible non-Jews, in government and outside of government, will be confused, disturbed, annoyed and perhaps irritated to impatience. At a time when unity is the cry, there is no legitimate reason why some peace cannot be achieved between the official Zionist organizations and the Committee for a Jewish Army. An explanation to the Jewish public is due!

▼

ROBERT MOSES, WRITING IN the current *Readers Digest,* declares that the present immigration law based on restriction "continues to have the overwhelming support of the American people"; and he agrees with them. "The simple truth is that we are fully as liberal in our immigration laws as any other great nation." This is cold comfort to the Jews of all the stricken areas who hold on to life in the desperate hope that the "great nations" will take them in. We should like to ask Mr. Moses: If such is the case, why are you not a Zionist? Why do you not point out that Palestine is the only country to which Jews could

(*Continued on Page* 20)

Hirsch and Graetz—Two Reinterpreters of Jewish Tradition

By LEO TREPP*

AMERICAN Judaism today conforms in several respects to the religious pattern of Western European Jewry of the middle of the nineteenth century. At that time the various religious groups were busily engaged with youthful enthusiasm in formulating theologically their respective beliefs a process which was, of course, abruptly halted with the advent of Nazism.

The early phase of German religious developments is paralleled closely by existing religious movements in the United States. The Orthodox element corresponds to the Judaism of the pre-Mendelsohn era. Reform in America is relatively extreme, just as it was in its initial stages in Germany. Between these poles, we find today a number of thinkers who aim to reinterpret Judaism with a satisfying resolution of the conflicting claims of modernism and traditionalism. We live in a highly developed culture which is closely linked to the past by an extensive tradition. Our lives as Jews are influenced by two potent forces, one horizontal, uniting all the members of our generation in all creeds and groups, and the other vertical, making all Jews part of an immense chain binding the past to the future. These two forces pull in different directions, creating strong tension. Our problem, simply put, is how best to lessen this tension. Standing at the juncture of intersecting lines, the Jew may give preference to one or the other influence, but he may never fully escape either. Like it or not, he participates in the life of this generation and is at the same time molded to a great extent by the subtle hands of tradition.

Fundamentally our problem today is similar to that faced by the early German reformers. It might, therefore, be highly profitable to analyze the religious conceptions of two men who, more than 100 years ago, grappled with this problem and, in so doing, became the spiritual reconstructionists of their generation.

Collaboration of Hirsch and Graetz

Both Hirsch and Graetz were keenly aware of the problem and, being of the same generation, attempted to find a solution along similar lines. Their differing conception of the importance to be attached to tradition, however, later drew them apart.

In 1837 Graetz wrote to Hirsch, who was then Rabbi in Oldenburg, that he had just read Hirsch's first book, the "Nineteen Letters of Ben Uziel," and was deeply stirred. Striving to raise himself above his humble environment through the acquisition of knowledge, Graetz had come in contact with contemporary thought which had shaken his faith in his Jewish beliefs. Doubt as to the validity of tradition assailed him. At that point he discovered Hirsch's book. It was the work of a man who had known doubt, who had undergone a crisis of spiritual uncertainty, and had emerged with his faith unshaken. While Graetz continued to struggle intellectually with his faith, while he went through that period which may be described, to paraphrase Descartes' words—as "Dubito ergo sum," (I doubt, therefore, I am), Hirsch penetrated to the source of his doubt and attained a

*Rabbi in Greenfield, Mass., formerly of Oldenburg, Germany.

fundamental affirmation, "Dubito, sed Judaeus sum," (I doubt, but I am a Jew). To Hirsch, this affirmation was convincingly validated by the values which Jewish tradition had produced.

Graetz, happy to have found a congenial thinker, unburdened himself of his doubts and problems to Hirsch, who invited him to come to Oldenburg and live with him. For three years, Graetz and Hirsch lived, worked and studied together in Oldenburg. These years may be regarded as most crucial. Since they were then young men beginning their careers, the ideas they developed during this period became fundamental principles of their teachings.

The Problem Posed By Emancipation

The foremost problem that confronted Hirsch's generation was whether to affirm the spiritual consequences of the Emancipation or to reject the Emancipation itself.

The Emancipation, while freeing the individual, had created the potentialities for an ideological split; it had made possible individual doubt and uncertainty. Should the Emancipation be affirmed? Hirsch says yes. He is himself an individualist, a child of his times. For, the individual is the cell of society and of the Jewish people. Hirsch is interested in the individual; the *"Yisroel Mensch,"* the "citizen Jew," as we may perhaps translate it, is the element out of which Jewry must be fashioned. But Hirsch goes further. Speaking of the citizen Jew, he implies that, in order to be considered a full Jew, one must regard himself as part of humanity. The ideal Jew for Hirsch is he who derives his strength from tradition which guarantees his survival as a Jew, and who also regards himself as part of humanity of which he is a citizen. Hirsch thus affirms the Emancipation, revealing clearly at the same time that he has reckoned with and has not shirked the problem. It must be understood, however, that Hirsch does not accept the Emancipation unconditionally but only insofar as it does not impair Jewish tradition.

Graetz followed Hirsch all the way. Even before he had met Hirsch, young Graetz affirmed the Emancipation in his personal practice. He studied hard to acquire secular knowledge, in which he saw the highway to a better fulfillment of his human and Jewish duties. But also in later years, after the two men drifted apart, their ideas and even their words remained strangely similar. In 1846, Graetz wrote his "Construction of Jewish History." In it he summarizes his thought in the following words: "We thus find that it seems to be our task, according to the Jewish conception of God, to organize a religious state which is conscious of its purpose and its duty and its relations to the whole world."

How similar these words are to Hirsch's in the final sentences to his "Choreb": "This high principle becomes evident, that, whilst Israel is being dispersed, nevertheless, not even the outward unity of Israel is being destroyed . . . the spiritual elements of our national life will be carried through the times of our exile to the final day of our prophesied reconstruction. That our non-Jewish brethren may build altars to the one god . . . is approved by Israel's teachings."

For Graetz and Hirsch, the individual Jew who is the nucleus, combines with other individuals to form the "Kingdom of Priests," which then becomes a Holy Nation. The stress is laid equally on holiness and national sovereignty, on relations between man and God and those between man and man, on tradition and modernity. The task of the Jew today is to prepare himself to live in contemporary culture while handing down, at the same

time, the traditional goods that were bequeathed to him.

The future of the Jewish people rests on the spirit, and the spirit is dependent on knowledge. In his "Sixteenth Letter," Hirsch tells us that, in his opinion, the traditional Jewish state could rightfully exist only as the laboratory of the Torah spirit to serve as an example to the world of life lived under the spirit. The future Jewish state, according to Hirsch, will have to be built on the same basis. Graetz, on his part, interprets the entire history of the sovereign Jewish state as a struggle between two conceptions of the aims of the state: the imperialistic or political conception, and the spiritual conception (*Geist* and *Reich*). Imperialism, revolting aganist the spirit of God, finally led the Jewish state to its doom.

Both men stressed the centrality of education, Jewish and secular. Hirsch developed his program of *torah in derek eretz*, which in itself revealed how deeply Graetz and Hirsch were influenced, on the one hand, by the trends of the time and, on the other, by traditional thought. This was the period in which the importance of Jewish Science (*Wissenschaft des Judentums*) was duly recognized, and scientific scholarship was revered as the highest authority. Hirsch was not immune to the contemporary idealization of science and wrote "In Mendelsohn's time, they should have built Judaism on a scientific basis, and we would be better off today." Graetz was even more deeply influenced by prevailing thought and wrote in his application to the Breslau Seminary, "The desire for knowledge has shaped my life."

But tradition, too, was not neglected by Hirsch and Graetz. Although accepting wholeheartedly the insights of science, they insisted on its being complemented by spiritual values. In this way they solved or endeavored to solve the perennial problem of dual influence which is constantly impinging on the Jew both as Jew and as world-citizen.

The Esthetic Aspect of Judaism

Both Graetz and Hirsch agreed that knowledge alone is insufficient, that another facet must be added to Jewish culture, the esthetic. The sense of appreciation of the beautiful had atrophied in the generations of ghettodom. Hirsch and Graetz were far-sighted enough to demand its restoration. The introduction of beauty into Orthodox life was greatly instrumental in its preservation and also helped to draw the various groups closer together.

Although Hirsch believed that the Torah and tradition alone contained the sufficient explanation of the true meaning of the universe, he was constrained to admit the spiritual potency of beauty: "The beauty of the world gives evidence of God's ruling hand."

Hirsch was deeply influenced by Kant, who combined the ideas of beauty and moral law, using one to explain the other, speaking of "the starry sky above me and the moral law within me." Coincidently, Hirsch also gave evidence of being under the influence of the Psalmist, especially the author of the 19th Psalm, who, as he himself explains, follows the same line of thought.

Graetz was drawn to similar conclusions. He writes, "He (Hirsch's father) brought me a Kusari, which gave me much pleasure, for Jehudah Halevi, *c'est mon homme.*" To Graetz, Jehudah Halevi was one of the few Jews with true poetic inspiration, who see the whole of Judaism as one poetic institution, having the purpose of guiding our lives towards poetic enthusiasm. Jehudah was to Graetz the only Jewish poet who wrote almost entirely with genuine feeling.

And so, for Graetz, as for Hirsch, beauty and poetry were essential to the

harmonious development of the cultured Jew, destined to build the Jewish national future.

Graetz and Hirsch were thus fundamentally in accord. Both affirmed the Emancipation; for the extent to which the Jew could participate, as Jew and as citizen, in the affairs of the world was directly dependent upon his ability most effectively to combine tradition with secular culture.

In accordance with the principles of the period, they came to the conclusion that, in order to be both Jew and citizen, it was necessary to acquire knowledge and a feeling for beauty. Being bound to tradition, however, they conceived of knowledge and beauty only as tools for the spirit, as instruments promoting a higher conception of God. This program envisaged a time when Israel would be restored to sovereign status under God's rule among the family of the nations. I feel that these thoughts have lost nothing of their importance for Jewish reconstruction.

Disagreements Between Hirsch and Graetz

Having traced the fundamental thoughts upon which Graetz and Hirsch agree, it might be appropriate to sketch further developments in their lives which led them apart and finally made of them bitter antagonists.

The differences between them, which were much more than academic, serve to illustrate the dangers inherent in any attempted reconstruction of Judaism. It is impossible to avoid the human element, conclusions based on highly personal ratiocination, in any construction or system. Tradition is subject to a variety of interpretations and every leader, consciously or otherwise, displays an emphasis either for tradition or for modern ideas. This ever-present danger can be avoided only through the formation of schools of thought and movements in which a large number of men cooperate in arriving at decisions. Graetz and Hirsch, however, represented only one individual against the other, the latter much more sympathetic to tradition than the former. Hirsch, who relied on tradition as his highest authority, remained set in his idea, while Graetz, who regarded himself as the highest authority, gradually pulled away from him.

The change in Graetz, a gradual one, is discernible in its initial phases. In his diary is found a very revealing analysis of his emotions on the three Rosh Hashonah days, 5597, 5600, and 5601. In the first year he writes, "The *tephilat Musaf* opened in me a well of tears and in deepest devotion I offered my prayers and my tears." In this sentiment, reflecting the influence of Hirsch and tradition, Graetz reveals his affinity with the authors of the prayers and with those who uttered them in the course of the centuries. Three years later he writes, "I don't know what has dulled my feelings. The *Uveken ten pahdeka* still electrifies me, but it holds no pearls any more. This attitude of mine is not a sign of any progress on my part, it shows no higher grade of enlightenment, rather of decadence, as I confess shamefully." Here Graetz realizes the spiritual dangers which confront him in substituting for unquestioning devotion an objectively critical attitude. He retains, however, the ability to note introspectively the change which is coming over him, an ability which gradually is lost to him. He left Oldenburg and sought to find a position, preaching in a number of congregations, but without success. He became bitter and disillusioned, but his words are nevertheless surprisingly harsh as he writes "This Rosh Hashonah has not touched me. I had time to follow idle thoughts (during the services). The Prussian Garrison-preacher (another candidate for the rab-

binate) was there again and gave so patriotic a sermon that one was inclined to become a Jacobin." Granted that Graetz was dissatisfied with the sermon, his discontent need not have carried over into the rest of the service. It appears that services as a whole had lost their appeal to Graetz; he was now "betwixt and between."

Graetz, in this stage, typifies the danger which every reformer faces. It is fortunate for us that he finally turned back and regained again his faculty for self-criticism. But throughout the rest of his career, Graetz, in common with the other scientists of his generation who had chosen to rely on their own judgments, was destined to remain an outsider, no longer classified with any group and fated to stand alone.

Graetz once characterized himself unwittingly in his portrait of Johanan ben Zaccai whom he praised as the man who, by strength of his personality, had saved and reorganized Judaism after the fall of the Temple. Samson Raphael Hirsch in a review of this chapter attacked Graetz violently, insisting that it was not the personality of Rabbi Johanan but the tradition which he brought to the people that saved Israel.

Hirsch was bitter because he realized that, in spite of fundamental agreement as to the value of the individual, Graetz had reached certain conclusions in his writings and in his practices which were abhorrent to Hirsch. The latter still hoped to be able to save Graetz and therefore chided him when confronted with Graetz's indirect portrait of himself.

But Graetz was unable to retreat; he had to follow the call from within. Yet he sould not accept the principles of the Reform group. And so, during his entire life, he stood midway between Hirsch and Reform, representing most perfectly the synthesis between tradition and modern culture. Unfortunately this synthesis was valid only for Graetz himself. What was natural for him, following the dictates of his own conscience, appears inconsistent to us. Graetz, for instance, condemns the Shulhan Aruk in theory and upholds it in practice. His exegesis of the Hagiographa is radical while his interpretation of the legal parts of the Pentateuch is conservative. He demonstrates, however, the happiness attainable by him who can find the proper synthesis. It is unfortunate that Graetz stood alone, unable to found a school of thought which could correct and criticize inconsistencies and propagate his doctrines.

And so Graetz faced recrimination both from advocates of Orthodoxy and of Reform. Hermann Cohen criticized him for not appreciating rightly the contribution of Reform Judaism as creator of the Science of Judaism. On the occasion of Graetz's centenary, Cohen, the great philosopher wrote, "His (Graetz's) character deprived him of the ability to gain the objectivity of a judge in the strivings of the various parties of the Jewish people—he failed when, as historian, he had to occupy the chair of supreme judge of history." Cohen acutely recognized the one weakness in Graetz's position—his "character." By this he meant his overstressed self-reliance. But in this respect Graetz was a characteristic product of his age.

The conflicting viewpoints of Hirsch and Graetz are clearly exemplified in their conceptions of education. Fundamentally Graetz agreed with Hirsch, but being more affected by modern currents, he identified the struggle between Judaism and paganism with the struggle between spirit and nature. Graetz identifies spirit with knowledge and, regarding spirit as the prime motive power, he denies Judaism its share in nature. Hirsch, on his part, quite justly insists that there is no conflict, that, on the contrary, nature must be regarded as a revelation of the

spirit leading to deeper appreciation of God.

Finally the two drifted apart in their fundamental conceptions of the esthetic. On one occasion Graetz took Hirsch's entire rabbinical work to task because he found a lack of decorum in one of Hirsch's rural congregations. For Graetz, beauty must be upheld even at the sacrifice of tradition; whereas Hirsch naturally subordinated esthetic appeal to law and tradition. Building on the same foundation, both men created different structures. Neither fully accomplished his task of rebuilding Jewry by reinterpreting Judaism.

The religious path of the constructive genius is always dangerous and difficult. He incurs the danger of overstressing or understressing the relative weights of modern culture and tradition. He also, if he is a strong personality, runs the risk of creating for himself a workable synthesis which is inapplicable to society as a whole.

But at all times endeavors at reconstruction have been fruitful. They have clarified the problems and have contributed to their solution. The impulse to continue the effort should be encouraged. The work is great; the reward is greater still.

Beware the Lovers of Humanity!

By MIRIAM J. COHEN

When the Jew in America says he loves humanity so much that the massacres of millions of Jews in Poland touch him emotionally no more than the suffering of other peoples in this war, beware. Ask his help for the heroic Greeks, the gallant Dutch, the proud Norwegians, ask his cooperation and assistance for the leaders of those countries who have set up governments-in-exile and who keep the light of faith and hope burning in the hearts of their stricken but uncrushed people; his response will be in the best tradition of America, generous, warm-hearted, sympathetic, eager to help the brave and relieve the oppressed. But ask that same Jew to do something about those who are left among the tortured Jews of Europe; immediately he becomes a lover of humanity, who cannot be interested in special groups when all the world is bathed in blood and millions are dying daily.

These lovers of humanity will dedicate their lives, if need be, to rebuild Lidice, to insure that France and Greece, Norway and Holland, Denmark and Poland shall once again be free. That's what we're fighting the war for, isn't it? But the Jews of Europe — that is another story for the Jews of America. Liberal opinion throughout the world will take care of the Jews. Humanity is greater than any of its parts—the four freedoms will include the Jews. Let them wait for the peace which will come with victory and all will be well with them.

In Heaven's name, what monstrous distortions of logic, what fantastic perversions of thought have cast their spell over our people? Who can so love humanity that he is deaf to the anguished cries from the ghettoes of Poland? Who can be so liberal-minded, have such sublime faith in the miracle of the future, that he cannot pause to hear the present prayers of the uneasy dead, the agonized pleas of the helpless living? Is there in all the world a people so faint of heart, so sick of soul as our Jewish humanity-lovers?

If they would at least have the honesty to say: I do not consider myself Jewish,

except by accident! But no. They prate about loyalty to their people and to their traditions. Who are their people? What is their tradition? To whom or to what are they loyal? Can they delude themselves into believing that such callousness, such indifference, such apathy to the suffering of their people means loyalty to America? America whose name means freedom, whose flag means liberty, whose tradition is fearless championship of the suffering and oppressed, does not need or want such loyalty.

Who are their people? They say they are Americans. What American would stand by and watch millions of American civilians subjected to unspeakable torture and degradation without raising heaven and earth to stop it. To whom do they belong, these would-be citizens of the world? They have denied the Jewish people. They feel no special responsibility for them, any more than for all oppressed humanity. But then, by another curious mental trick, they are often the very ones who speak in the name of the Jewish people. The Jewish people, they say, have the utmost confidence that the post-war world will bring freedom and equality to all people. The Jews do not want a nation, a flag, a home, and you can take our word for it. We, who deny any special identity with the Jewish people, are prepared to tell you what they want. We who are lovers of humanity are surely more to be trusted than the narrow-minded nationalists. We are prepared to sell the future of our people cheap for the sake of world interest.

What do they buy that is worth the price of betraying their people and insulting humanity? Do they fancy they are buying security or safety for themselves or their children? Where is the security that is bought by keeping silent about the terror that falls by night and by day on the young and the old, the sick and the well, the brave and the cowards, the wise and the foolish—for none is spared the mad destruction visited upon every Jew by the dehumanized Nazis? These are not men killed in a war; these are not men fighting for their countries mowed down by superior forces. These are civilians taken from their homes in the dead of night, by the hundreds and by the thousands, to be gassed in lethal chambers, to be machine gunned, to be degraded, humiliated, tortured to death. This is not war. This is a deliberate, declared policy of extermination, on such a large scale and so well organized that it staggers the imagination.

And yet, in the name of humanity, our Jews have no special interest. Are they naive or are they knaves? Are they cowards, or are they fools? How can we sit by content with a few verbal protests, a few well chosen words of sympathy? The United Nations have spoken. If they are to act we must make them act. We cannot remain silent. Some arrangement must be made whereby those of our people who can escape can be saved. The doors of neutral countries must be opened, the doors of Palestine must be opened, the doors of America must be opened. It can be done without interfering with the war effort.

This is no special appeal for a Jewish flag, a Jewish home, a Jewish nation. There is nothing controversial in this. Zionists and anti-Zionists, Jews of all shades and opinions and economic status can speak up. We cannot leave it all to the Yishuv. There isn't time to leave it to the post-war settlement. To every Jew we say: our people will be destroyed. Will you go down in history as the generation which so loved the world that you let your people be murdered while you sat back and watched. "For why should ye die, O House of Israel?"

Music Notes

By JUDITH K. EISENSTEIN

IN the past month, in New York, there have been several events of interest in the field of Jewish music. First, there was the Festival of Jewish Arts at Town Hall, conducted by Jacob Weinberg. Second, the Jewish Music Alliance Festival was held in Carnegie Hall, under the direction of Max Helfman. Third, a program of rare instrumental and choral music was given in Town Hall under the auspices of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, with Lazare Saminsky as its guiding spirit. Granted the time and the space, a very lively study could be made of contrasting programs, and, above all, of contrasting audiences. Music was heard which ranged from the interminable strumming of Yiddish tunes on a hundred mandolins, to the rather precious combination of 'cello and harp rendering a Caucasian fragment from the Song of Songs; from the earnest, if artless, singing of militant *"playtze zu playtze"* songs by hard working amateurs, to the elaborate and careful exposition of decidedly modern music by professional vocal ensemble. The three audiences represented a cross-section of New York Jewry, and could be characterized briefly by the degree of hush which prevailed, or the total lack of it.

Out of the welter of impressions, favorable and unfavorable, there remains the recollection of a few compositions which should remain in concert repertoires. It is on these compositions that we should like to comment here.

The first, occurring in the Weinberg festival, was Jacobi's new work for soprano and two pianos, called "The Prophecy of Nehemiah." This was sung by Maria Van Delden. The text of the composition (in English) was drawn from passages in Nehemiah referring to the rebuilding of the Wall of Jerusalem after the first exile. Jacobi as a composer seems to be concerned with the startling timeliness of the words, rather than with their archaic quality. He has produced a stirring and passionate interpretation, a sort of Nehemiah in modern dress, culminating with the call, "Come let us build the walls of Jerusalem, that we may no longer be a shame." It was impossible at a first hearing of this intricate and difficult score to discern more than the broadest outlines of its closely knit form. Nor could we determine whether it had its roots in traditional material, for even the most familiar of traditional material becomes transmuted beyond recognition at the hands of the modern composer.

However, there were moments which moved the hearer directly without benefit of rationale, and these are highly to be prized. It is true that Jacobi's music has a way of bursting its bonds, which were, in this case, the limited medium he had provided. Instead of two pianos we should have liked to hear a full-blown orchestra. Instead of a single soprano voice, however powerful, we felt the need of men's voices—more than one of them at that. Undoubtedly, practical considerations caused the composer to restrict his writing to this form. The result was a loss of color in the instrumental sections, and a serious overtaxing of the singer.

The second composition, which was new to this listener, was vastly different. It was a chorus entitled "Nishka," by Schaeffer, sung beautifully by Max Helfman's "Jewish People's Philharmonic Chorus" in the Carnegie Hall festival. This piece is in the Yiddish tradition, written by the man who was the moving spirit in organizing the Jewish Music Alliance of workers' choruses. This same Schaeffer was responsible for some pretty bad compositions on the same program, but in "Nishka" he rose to great heights. Here was the only glint of humor in the deadly seriousness of all three programs. We do not refer to humor in the Yiddish text, which was difficult for this listener to grasp at first hearing, in spite of the apparently good diction of the singers. There was skill and humor and lightness in the music, and these are qualities which are at a premium in our contemporary works. May we hear more of "Nishka."

On the same program, and like "Nishka," appearing well after midnight to the somewhat worn out audience, was a cantata called *"Der Ruf fun Vilner Rabbonim,"* for baritone solo and chorus, by Herbert Haufrecht. The text here was the manifesto issued by the Rabbis of Vilna on the occasion of the invasion of Poland by Hitler. It is treated in the style which has grown out of documentary plays and films, and which has been utilized extensively by our younger American composers. Mr. Haufrecht has dealt with it completely, indeed. Its various moods of imprecation, prayer and militancy are disciplined into clarity of form and line. The choral and piano sections were particularly effective in spite of the befuddling addition of an organ to the piano part. Mr. Haufrecht, like so many contemporaries, is unkind to his soloist. The melodic line here seems to have been imposed almost artificially over the instrumental and choral parts, and to have little of its own artistic meaning. The responsibility for this may lie in the lack of inherent poetry in the text, which swoops from extravagances of emotion to plateaus of the commonplace. We should like to hear Jewish music from Mr. Haufrecht (who has already begun to establish himself outside the Jewish field), on a text of higher quality, or perhaps better still, without hindrance of text at all.

The last composition we wish to mention is not a new one, nor is it old enough to be rightfully presented as either rare or archaic. Milner's *"Un'sane Tokef"* was sung in Saminsky's concert, by his own Temple Emanuel choir and soloist. Milner himself was one of the most gifted of the Russian Renaissance group of Jewish composers. His setting for this most magnificent of prayers is truly worthy of it, and that is high praise. Here is typical cantorial art blended with mature polyphonic writing, with no loss to either one. Here is depth of feeling without bathos, and great religious dignity without coldness. In the case of this composition, too, we had to make allowances for performance. It requires a full choir and not a handful of good soloists. There were disturbing discrepancies between the organist and the singers. But the music itself was there, and that too is something to be grateful for.

This may seem a small harvest for the height of the musical season in New York. Actually, it is not, in proportion to the general field. Also it bears healthy signs of life. It indicates that there are compositions from the past that are yet unknown and still deserve a hearing, and composers, at the start of their careers, who may yet give voice to the soul of the Jewish people.

Correspondence

Comment on "Glicenstein in Search of His Brethren"

Sirs:

The career of Enrico Glicenstein in America was not a happy one. He spent his last years in this country struggling against tremendous difficulties. This country did not give him the honor he deserved. Nevertheless, he worked hard and faithfully until the day of his untimely death.

Glicenstein asked for little in this country, only that he be permitted to work in peace. Even that little was often denied him. He was not a demanding individual. He was the true artist, born to give rather than to take.

When I read the story, "Glicenstein in Search of His Brethren" by Rabbi Friedman in the February 5 issue of *The Reconstructionist,* I felt it was hardly a fit tribute to so great an artist. To me this bit of anecdota was in bad taste. I can hardly commend your editorial staff for permitting its appearance in a serious periodical. . . .

Permit me to refer to Rabbi Friedman's article. From his account we learn that one day the Rabbi found Glicenstein in his synagogue in the city of Syracuse. Glicenstein was poorly dressed carrying two newspaper-wrapped bundles. The Rabbi tells us that he mistook Glicenstein for a transient "schnorrer." The Rabbi was somewhat abrupt and came quickly to the point with this transient who "appeared humiliated. But then I had met transients before who simulated indignation. It was part of their technique." As if by a miracle this "transient" turned out to be Enrico Glicenstein who, we learn, did not come for charity but came in search of his "brethren."

Then we learn that the Rabbi satisfied Glicenstein's search by inviting him to his dinner table and later took him on a visit to Auburn prison, where the Rabbi introduced Glicenstein to the "boys" after which he led him to the women's ward, where Enrico met the "girls." According to the Rabbi, these prison inmates were some of the most hardened "lifers." Glicenstein graciously obliged by entertaining this congregation with a little talk. This little prison excursion must have been a great experience for Glicenstein in search of his brethren.

The question arises, if Glicenstein was good enough tor the Rabbi's prison congregation, was he not good enough to talk to the Jews in Syracuse?

Perhaps the Rabbi was not interested in Glicenstein's art but rather in the amazing personality of the artist. At any rate, we learn nothing about any exhibition being arranged for him, nor of any commission given Glicenstein. Nor do we learn anything about the great sculptor's art. However, we do learn that it was a "goy" who first invited Glicenstein to his home in Syracuse where, as a guest, he made his home. There is no doubt that this "goy" respected and honored this old man not because he was "Prof. Glicenstein of Rome" but because this "goy" loved art and artists.

This story by the good Rabbi is to me a symbol of the unfortunate treatment that all Jewish artists undergo at the hands of their own brethren. Here was an opportunity virtually knocking on the Rabbi's synagogue door. Art is a spiritual tool that a Rabbi can use today if he has imagination. I can only point in sadness to the Church, where art was so well understood and encouraged. The Church actually changed the face of European civilization through the medium of art.

When Glicenstein stood in that synagogue door, he was not merely "searching for his brethren." This lonely old man with so great a gift within him was searching for his *spiritual* brethren.

But this is an old story. The Jewish artist is like Joseph who was presented with a coat of many colors by his father. We all know the story of how Joseph was disliked by his brothers and how finally when Joseph "made good" in the gentile world, the Jews flocked to his door. Joseph was instrumental in bringing much blessing on the house of Israel. . . .

LIONEL S. REISS

A Suggestion for the Day of Mourning

Sirs:

Thank you for publishing the article . . . or rather statement bv the students of the J.T.S. "Retribution Is Not Enough." I have been waiting for a word like this and for some constructive suggestions like those for ever so long; kindly convey my gratitude and appreciation to Messrs. Golinkin, Lipnick and Sachs. I should like to add a suggestion to their various plans: I think we should make the terrifying matter of the Ninety-Three Maidens—this *kiddush-hashem,* as you call it—our Lidice; we ought to read this Letter either in Hebrew or in English before saying the Kaddish as the students suggested in every Synagogue. . . just as they used to read the poem by Edna St. Vincent Millay. This recital ought to take place either during the "Aid European Jewry Now" week or on the day of mourning . . . which ought to be given more and earlier publicity than the day of fast on December 2, which was widely ignored here . . .

Let me add that both my husband and my-

self most sincerely appreciate and enjoy reading *The Reconstructionist* . . . it is like a breath of fresh air here in this somewhat stuffy atmosphere. . . . So once more thank you . . . and a hearty *yeyasher kohaka*. . . .

BERTHA BADT-STRAUSS
Shreveport, La.

Critique of "Toward a Real Jewish Education"

Sirs:

In reference to Dr. Chomsky's article, "Toward a Real Jewish Education" in your issue of January 22, I feel impelled to point out some significant flaws in the "Philadelphia Plan" of education for living which must not be overlooked and cannot go unchallenged.

There is, first, the danger of identifying the "Federation" or the "Allied Appeal" as the Jewish community. The Jewish community is more than a matter of organization for the gathering of funds or administratiin of relief.

There is also the danger that the limitations of one's financial responsibilities to Jewish life are to be confined to the limitations of the Allied Appeal. The faulty psychology of "Charity begins at home," (and ends there), applies to most contributors who consider their contributions to the annual drive an excuse for not contributing to many worthwhile Jewish cultural and philanthropic institutions not included in the appeal but certainly part of the Jewish communal life. Thus, to make the "Allied Appeal" the synonym for the Jewish community creates a problem.

Most disturbing, however, is the failure to realize that the children, who will now have an opportunity to sense the working reality of Jewish collective life, through the Jewish Activities program, will suffer a sense of frustration. How can we teach Jewish children respect for democracy, not the "democratic traditions" of our people, but democracy in Jewish life, when the Jewish organizational structure is basically undemocratic? (Dr. Chomsky makes no provision for such a realistic situation). Representation on the Board of the Federations or the Allied Appeals, in practically every city, is not extended to the contributors but confined to representatives of the institutions that are beneficiaries. Directorates are interlocking and self-perpetuating. Even when recent reorganization has made for elections, they are "Ja" elections. When this writer pointed out the need to democratize the Allied Jewish Appeal by making it "fully representative of the entire community," the answer was that the reorganization must be a gradual development through a "limited democracy." If the Jewish child is to "learn by doing," there must be a reconstitution of every agency in each community and the extension of its democratic base (certainly the reconstruction of a Federation or United Jewish Appeal on a more democratic basis).

Only thus, can the Jewish community serve as a spiritual force to develop a passionate yearning for Jewish and democratic living.

RABBI AARON DECTER
Philadelphia, Pa.

PURIM (*Continued from Page 7*)

ing dissension and inciting to subversive activities. The notion that the relation of any nation to its Jews is a domestic affair is no longer tenable in view of the way anti-Semitism has served Nazism. But it is not only *German* anti-Semitism that is a menace.

There is enough native American anti-Semitism, manifest in social and economic discrimination, which would continue to be a menace even should American troops march into Berlin and retribution be visited on all the Nazis who have perpetrated atrocities against Jews. To paraphrase Vice-President Wallace's statement on Russia—the future well-being of the world depends upon the extent to which Christendom and Jewry can live together.

REALITIES AND VALUES

(*Continued from Page 9*)

go after the war? Another question, Mr. Moses: Is this the time, when millions of your fellow-Jews are being slaughtered, to fire the opening gun of an anti-immigration campaign? Don't you think that, at this precise moment, it is more fitting to raise your voice in protest against barbarism? Need you, as a Jew, be more zealous to keep out the stranger than the Federal Council of Churches or the *Commonweal,* whom you quote as favoring immigration? One more thing, Mr. Moses. Would you please change your name?